UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MF

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/090,119	06/04/98	HALSTEAD	M 777.090US1

TM02/0228

SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG WOESSNER & KLUTH
P O BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402

EXAMINER
FOURSON, G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	4

DATE MAILED:
02/28/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Jun 4, 1998*

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire ____3____ month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) *1-21* _____ is/are pending in the application.

    Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) *1-21* _____ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

    ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None   of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

        ☐ received.

        ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

        ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    *Certified copies not received: _____ .

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- *SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES* ---

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.　The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2.　**Claims 1-3, 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as**

being anticipated by Henckel (6,105,036).

　　With respect to claims 1, 8, 10, 15, and 19, reading a persistent representation

[col 4 line 21, source file] of a complex data object [col. 4 line 21, multimedia objects]

containing a sequence of executable instructions [col 4 lines 24-25, "ordered arrangement

of program statements"] directly executable on a program interpreter [col 4 lines 33-36],

and the program interpreter for executing/interpreting the instructions as a sequence/series

of calls [col 4 lines 24-25, "ordered arrangement of program statements"] on a library of

predefined functions [Henckel notes in col 4 lines 41-51 that VRML is one example of a

language providing a collection of interpretable statements.] to directly construct [col 4

lines 58-67 states, "As discussed above, embodiments ... display objects in ...or

multimedia representations."] the multi-component data object from the representation.

　　As to **claims 2, 3, 11, and 16**, Henckel teaches display or presentation of

multimedia objects [col 4 lines 58-67].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   **Claims 12-14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Henckel (6,105,036).

As to **claims 12-14 and 21**, the interpreter is a local stack-based virtual machine

including a temporary storage array. Examiner takes "Official Notice" (see MPEP

2144.03) that the advantages of utilization of virtual machine operating systems on stack

based processing hardware were well known at the time the invention was made.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to utilize the virtual machine in combination with the teachings of

Henckel, because the accepted benefits of the stack based virtual machine would have

been expected when utilized for its known intended purpose.

5.   **Claims 1, 4-7, 15, 17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Celi, Jr. et al. (US 6,157,933) in view of Jaworski (Java 1.1 Second

Edition).

With respect to claims 1, 4-7, 15, 17, 19, and 20, reading a persistent

representation [Java animation image applet stored on server], interpreting the

instructions [As was known to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made, Java applets are comprised of Java byte codes interpreted by a Java Virtual

Machine included with many common HTML browsers], calling different ones of

predefined functions in accordance with the instructions to construct the data object

directly from the representation [col 3 lines 1-13],

Jaworski provides example applets on pages 734-737. It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the example

applets of Jaworski with the embedded web page requesting/displaying of Celi, Jr. et al.,

because Celi, Jr. et al. recognized that applet content may be embedded. From the code

example listings 40.1-40.4, Jaworski teaches wherein some functions return an explicit

result [Listing 40.1, "public void paint" returns the result "Graphics g"], wherein some

functions have arguments [Listing 40.1 calls functions "g.setFont," "g.setColor," "and

"g.drawString," which all use arguments.], a call to one of the functions includes a call to

another function as an argument of the first function ["g.setFont utilizes the method "new

Font" as an argument], a call to one of the functions includes obtaining a constant value

as its argument [see "g.drawString"], and wherein some of the instructions are

compressed identifiers for different ones of a predefined set of methods [Method

resolution between similarly named functions in object oriented programming may be

facilitated through argument matching.].

Pertinent Prior Art

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure:

a. Dyer et al. (US 5,754,849) teaches self-describing objects for storage and

transmission across system boundaries.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to **Gary Fourson**

at telephone number **(703) 305-4392** or E-mail at the address **gary.fourson@uspto.gov**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

The fax numbers for formal (703-308-9051), to be intended for entry into the application, or informal (703-305-9731) communications may be utilized for expedited transactions.

gsf

February 26, 2001

CALVIN E. OBERLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700